



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBUILDING & DRY DOCK CO. *v.*  
JONES.

June 14, 1906.

[54 S. E. 314.]

**1. Corporations—Charter—Construction—Powers — Ultra Vires.—**

Where a corporation's charter authorized it to construct and maintain a dry dock, and to build and repair vessels and boats of all dimensions and materials, and it was necessary for these purposes to erect a breakwater and bulkhead and fill in the space by dredging, these acts were not ultra vires.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see vol. 12, Cent. Dig. Corporations, §§ 1517, 1518.]

**2. Fish—Oysters—Assignment of Location—Rights of Assignee.—**

Under Code 1904, § 2137, making the rights of an assignee of a location for an oyster bed subject to such rights as any person has previously acquired, the rights of an assignee are subject to the rights of a dock and shipbuilding company, previously acquired under its charter, to dredge the river for the construction of its shipyard, covering part of the area assigned as an oyster bed location, and the assignee is not entitled to damages for the dredging.

NEWPORT NEWS & O. P. RY. & ELECTRIC CO. *v.* LAKE et al.

June 14, 1906.

[54 S. E. 328.]

**1. Writ of Error—Instructions—Review — Record — Evidence.—**

Where the refusal of instructions is sought to be reviewed on a writ of error, the evidence should be made a part of the record by bill of exceptions.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see vol. 3, Cent. Dig. Appeal and Error, § 2933.]

**2. Eminent Domain—Assessment of Compensation—Instructions to Commissioners.—**

Where, prior to proceedings by a street railway company to condemn a right of way over certain land, defendants had recovered the land from the railroad company in ejectment, an instruction that, in considering what was a just compensation, the commissioners must consider to what uses it might be put by the owners, and that if they had dedicated the strip to the public while they owned the fee, such ownership was subject to the rights of the public to freely travel on and over the strip, was properly refused as erroneously authorizing the commissioners to consider defendants' rights in the land, which had been disposed of by the court both in the order appointing them and directing them to consider what would be a just compensation for the fee simple title to the land and in the ejectment proceeding.

**3. Same.**—The instruction was also properly refused as uncertain and misleading, in that it declared that if the owners had dedicated

the land to the public in "whole or in part" the public was entitled to travel over all of it.

**4. Eminent Domain—Compensation for Property Taken—Value.—**

A strip of land sought to be condemned had been occupied by a railway continuously for many years, during which time the strip had been repurchased by defendants for default in the payment of a debt secured by a deed of trust on the land. Held, that by defendants' purchase under the deed of trust, they acquired the property in its then condition, and hence an instruction limiting their recovery to a sum based on the value of the land when the railway was constructed was properly refused.

**5. Writ of Error—Record—Review of Instructions.—**Where instructions copied into the record were nowhere made a part of it by any bill of exceptions, they could not be reviewed on writ of error.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see vol. 3, Cent. Dig. Appeal and Error, §§ 2416, 2376.]

---

CHESAPEAKE & O. RY. CO. *v.* COMMONWEALTH.

June 14, 1906.

[54 S. E. 331.]

**Railroads—Transportation Across River—Statutes.—**Under Act Feb. 27, 1879, authorizing a railroad company to purchase the franchises and property of the J. & K. Company, which had been chartered to construct a waterway from the head of tidewaters on the J. river, connecting with those of the K. river, the railroad company to furnish to the people on the south of J. river, for transportation across the river to its railroad, "facilities, the same or at least equal to those now afforded by the J. & K. Company"; and Act May 20, 1887 (Acts 1887, Ex. Sess. p. 422, c. 329), providing that, by reason of petitions of numerous residents of the J. river valley, who claimed that serious injuries were being inflicted on them by maintenance of certain dams across the J. river, and that their removal would be not only beneficial to health, but to property, "improving sanitary conditions and lowering the flood lines," commissioners should be appointed to examine into the feasibility of removing dams belonging to said railroad company, and that, on the report of the commissioners being made, the railroad company should have authority to remove the dams reported as practical and proper to be removed: and that if they were so removed the railroad company should not be liable for any damages claimed to result from such removal, the only facility furnished by the J. & K. Company having been the waterway, boats thereon having been run by others paying tolls for its use, the removal pursuant to the act of 1887, which is valid as an exercise of the police power, of a dam erected by the J. & K. Company, such removal preventing transportation by a ferry across the river at that point, does not require the railroad company to furnish a bridge or other means for transportation across the river at such point.